

8135-6-15
16

K

THE
EVIDENCE
SUMMED UP;
OR
A STATEMENT
OF THE
APPARENT CAUSES
AND
OBJECTS OF THE WAR.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR D. I. EATON, AT THE COCK AND SWINE,
NO. 74, NEWGATE-STREET.

1794

PRICE ONE SHILLING.

V. I. D. E. N. C. E.

THE
LIBRARY OF THE
BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

77

1079
185

INTRODUCTION.

AS among the political pamphlets, sanctioned with the unequivocal approbation of Government, and rewarded by pensions, that of Mr. Arthur Young, is particularly distinguished by the strong recommendations issued in its favor, by Mr. Reeves's, and other associated bodies. This pamphlet, therefore, may be considered as the Orthodox Creed, and the authentic Manifesto of the intentions of Ministers, and their associated supporters. As such, the principle it inculcates are important to be known. Of these, one is, "to resist every idea of Reform, upon principles of giving more power to the people:" another, that "extravagant Courts, selfish Ministers, and corrupt Majorities," are "intimately interwoven with our practical freedom;" and that, the House of Commons, "*which ought NEVER to be considered as the representative of the people, have produced the happiness of this country, by NOT speaking the will of the people;*" and it is recommended, that the right of petitioning, (meeting to form petitions) for a redress of grievances, should be by act of Parliament, forbidden, and declared to be illegal—and to crown the whole—to bring about and enforce these admirable regulations, it is declared, "we want, and ought to call for with one voice a MILITIA BANK AND FILE OF PROPERTY!" Such being the avowed sentiments of ministers and their associated supporters, it may be hoped, that those independent private persons, who have, in their different capacities, given their support to administration, only because they have not accustomed themselves to think on the subject of government,

B

vernment, will be awakened to a sense of the necessity of investigating the conduct of their public servants, and of no longer tacitly acquiescing in measures, without attempting to ascertain their real object, and tendency, and how far it is consistent with the prosperity and the safety of their country.—Such is the subject of these pages.

THE

[8]

T H E
EVIDENCE SUMMED UP, &c.

THE contrast between our situation in the Summer 1792, and in the present is great, and is alarming: and though the secret springs which produced the measures that have had such fatal consequences, could not then be developed, nor even suspected, except in part, still the consequences were foretold, and depreciated both in the senate and from the press. But in vain! the plans had been too deeply laid; and the nation, regardless or resentful of the warning voice, assumed the measures proposed as her own, and was indignant at those who presumed to disapprove! The delusion now begins to pass away, but the arts used to continue it by the actors in the scene, evince their determination to persist to the last. To such a conduct, however desperate—however pregnant with ruin to *Us*—*They* may have strong inducements: to recede—to admit that their object is unattainable, may be, after having gone such lengths, to *them*, as dangerous as to advance: *must* be accompanied by disgrace—*may* be attended by punishment. By persisting to the last gasp, they will at least put off the evil day, and will escape being CONDEMNED by their own confession. To canvass with freedom, the public measures of public men, was heretofore accounted the birth-right of an Englishman; but of late, not only the doctrines of divine right and passive obedience to *kings*, have been revived by the dignitaries of the Church, but also implicit confidence in

ministers, has been required, * and granted with a facility unprecedented!—But as the result has not been such, as to encourage this confidence, and as ministers *may* have an interest contrary to that of the nation, it seems a duty to endeavour to investigate their views, and the consequences resulting therefrom. The king can, by the law of England do no wrong, but ministers are held by it to be responsible for the measures pursued: nevertheless, the ministers of our too gracious sovereign, in these instances too gracious, have more than once abused his confidence without punishment. The prosecution of Mr. Wilkes, commenced in the year 1763, and was continued by different administrations, until the year 1769, when the House of Commons assumed the right to elect their own members for the county of Middlesex, in opposition to the election of the county. On this occasion, petitions from that and other counties were presented to the sovereign, enumerating this and many other violations of the constitution, by the influence of his ministers: To these petitions, his Majesty was induced to return no answer. Passing by the lesser violations of the principles of the constitution, I will next instance the American war; resulting from the right assumed by the British Government, to exercise despotic power over America;—to bind her “in all cases whatsoever;” and from a system of indirect attempts to establish that claim, persevered in it from the year 1765, until 1775, when they were changed for open war. This war and its object was strenuously opposed by the independent part of the Legislature, but it was carried by the minister’s majority; and in the House of Lords, (some aggressions having

* Thus, in the instance of the present war, when arguments in its vindication have failed, I have more than once been told, “you may depend upon it, sir, that the war was unavoidable—if it could have been avoided, it is certain that Mr. Pitt would have avoided it.”

taken place on both sides,) the then Earl of Mansfield, justified the perseverance in hostilities, on the plea of necessity and self defence ; saying, “ since we are at war “ we must go on—if we do not kill them, they will kill “ us *”. Having this high authority for the indispensable necessity, and consequently, the justice and policy of that war, the Legislature engaged in it with alacrity and zeal, in which laudable conduct, it is possible, that some of our worthy representatives might be further encouraged, by the conviction they had of the blessings of war to the state, in the share of these blessings which fell within their own immediate experience, in contracts, paymasterships, commissaryships, agencies, naval and military rank, &c. &c. : these were indeed sufficient to convince the most unbelieving, and of course, that war was decided to be most indispensable ; the people convinced of the incorruptible purity of their representatives, did not stop a tacit acquiescence in their opinion, but openly avowed it as their own, and petitioned his majesty for the continuance of the war ; these petitions were most graciously received, and the war prolonged even beyond the extent of the people’s wishes : our splendid victories were at length succeeded by defeats, and the public voice was heard on the side of peace : the minister still declared he would conquer, and the Legislature were no less willing to continue to take their share in the toil : they went on, therefore, until the funds being reduced so low, as to afford no prospect of raising the supplies for another campaign, the majority opposed the further continuance of the war : the minister would still have persevered, but being thus prevented, he retired undismayed, and with so little desertion from

* I have not read the noble Earl’s speech, since that time, so cannot assume that I have quoted his precise words ; but I well recollect the force of his argument.

the phalanx enlisted in his service, that none endeavoured to arrest his retreat, and he was enabled afterwards to return and divide the reins of Empire. To his death this phalanx remained faithful to his interest, and none dared, or found it practicable to call for retrospection. Above a hundred millions had been sunk in making havock of mankind—eighty thousand men slain—near six millions a-year added to taxes already confessedly burdensome—treason and civil war excited in the heart of America, for the avowed purpose of compelling her to submit to despotic power—to be bound “in all cases whatsoever,” by a power three thousand miles from her, and which had proved itself regardless of, and hostile to her interests. That America was too prosperous—that she must be reduced and humbled: this we were told was indispensable, and that not to succeed in it, would be ruin to this country. Have we succeeded? or has ruin been consequent on our defeat? on the contrary, America became independent, is more prosperous than before; her population and trade increased, the prosperity and trade of this island were increased in equal proportion. By defeat, we have been benefited: for what then did we wage war? The result was obvious to many at the beginning. How happens it then, that ministers are usually blind to consequences foreseen by less able men? Have we no reason to suspect that private interest may be the secret spring of their public conduct? that the real object of a premier may be, to increase the emoluments of his office; and by a proportionable increase of influence to secure himself from future responsibility! If these things were done; if the minister secured an influence which gave him a weight sufficient to preserve him from all apprehension of punishment, or even of resigning his sinecure places; if he did all this, doubtless, the war was beneficial to him, and

to

to those who were enriched by his distribution of the people's spoils. It was at the close of that war that our present premier began his career : he depreciated it with all the vehemence of youthful eloquence, which, aided by his paternal fame, pointed him out to the sanguine people, as the restorer of the national character. He called their attention to the contrast between our then degraded state, and the brilliancy of his father's administration : he ranged on the side of humanity and truth, and contributed his part to the ejection of the then Ruling Powers. After this, he took a part in the administration, which, in the sequel, was wasted in contest, with the coalition so fatal to the fame of Mr. Fox ; and which afforded a melancholy instance of the power of political intrigue, to relax the principles, and to mislead the most benevolent and comprehensive mind. Thus ousted from a share in the state management, the son of Chatham—the prejudices in his favor being not yet done away, stood forth the declared champion of the rights of the people. He had now had some experience of the nature of ministerial influence, and might perhaps have some apprehension, that the strong party which had routed him, might so entrench themselves within that fortification, that he could no otherwise hope to drive them out, but by levelling it with the dust : that admirable engineer, the Duke of Richmond, seems to have been actuated with the same views ; they united forces, and joining themselves to Mr. Horne Tooke, Mr. Frost, and other known enemies to that fortress, they issued from the Thatch'd House Tavern, their manifesto, calling upon the people at large, to unite with them for its destruction.

Having mentioned the name of Mr. Horne Tooke, it is incumbent upon me to pay one short tribute to his public virtues. Amongst all those who have taken an important

part in political transactions, he stands most conspicuous *, having passed all the meridian of life without uniting to any party—without soliciting, without accepting any place or any pension, or any kind of employ under a system he disapproves. Inaccessibile to any bribe, submitting to suffer every loss, to be calumniated, deprived of the good opinion of those to whose benefit all his labours were devoted, rather than to keep by deserving to lose it, by time-serving or apostacy. Adhereing invariably to the object of his avowed exertions, without regard to change of party, and foiling them all by the contrast of his uniformity to their versatility of principle—by all he is feared, and consequently hated by all. Therefore I felt no emotions of surprize (though I did of indignation) when I heard one of the pensioned zealots of the day dwell with malignant joy upon the circumstance of a new tribunal (a Court of Justiciary, I suppose, such as Mr. Dundas prepared us to expect, when he, in the House of Commons, foretold the sentence of that Court upon Mr. Gerrald, and lamented the want of similar tribunals in England; with, perhaps, the Reverend Justice, Mr. John Griffith, and some selected Members of Mr. Reeves's Association, to form Judges and Jury, and Thomas Dunn †, Oliver Pearfall ‡, and Benjamin Booth §, for evidences, after being duly instructed by the Justice) being to be constructed for the especial purpose of trying this gentleman for HIGH TREASON, and anticipating the manner of his execution. The turn of Fortune's wheel in Flanders seems, however, to

* I mean not to detract from the merit of any of the illustrious objects of ministerial malignity, sent to the shores of New Holland, for endeavouring to promote a more equal representation of the people; but Mr. Horne has stood forward singly in the same cause, and taken a decisive part.

† See Mr. Walker's Trial, page 9, and following.

‡ Ditto, p. 26, and following.

§ Ditto, p. 129, and following.

have

have dashed the confidence of our heaven-born Minister ; for we now are told that the Judges having duly considered the matter, Mr. Horne Tooke is no longer to be tried by a Special Court, but by a Common Court of Law, and not for HIGH TREASON, but for SEDITION. This being the case, it might have saved some useless trouble to the State, if neither that gentleman nor some others had been taken up at all, at least till a better opportunity offered ; for at present it is certain, that in an English Court of Justice, the evidence of Thomas Dunn* cannot be had, and neither that of Oliver Pearfall nor Benjamin Booth, could be depended upon : neither is it probable that the Rev. Justice Griffith singly, would be able to do any thing effectually : he might indeed call upon him “ at his own hotel” in the Tower, “ and dine with him ;” but to procure his condemnation for HIGH TREASON, his single evidence would be insufficient, and even to fix upon him the charge of SEDITION—it might fail with an unselected English Jury.

Returning from this digression, I observe, that we have here a clue, by which we may at once unravel the mystery, and account for Mr. Pitt’s commencing the declared zealous champion for the full and unqualified restoration of their elective rights to the people : a principle to which the uniform tenor of his conduct, since his establishment in plenitude of power, has been not merely indifferent, but hostile. He appears to have entered a candidate for ministerial elevation, with full confidence of obtaining it : the popular predilection seemed to confirm his hopes, when they were all at once dashed by the unexpected union of the phalanx of Lord North, with the

* See Walker’s Trial, p. 117. (Appendix.)

party which had so long contested, and had at length driven them from the field. This event, though fatal to Mr. Fox's popular fame, seemed to have established him firmly in the ministerial throne; and presented to the son of Chatham, the dismal prospect of wasting all the forenoon of his life in hopeless opposition. He had an example of the strength and attachment of that phalanx—he had seen them sustain their leader, and carry him through the most ruinous measures, unshaken and unawed by the conclusive arguments urged with unresisting earnestness, by the champion of the people's rights, and his illustrious coadjutors. All this they heard unmoved, and persisted, regardless of the consequences, long after the fulfilment of part of the long predicted calamities began to alarm the public mind: nor did they cease until they had reduced the country to the verge of ruin. They were *then* compelled by the public clamour to recede—with some disgrace—some loss of public estimation—but in other respects TRIUMPHANT, and enriched with the SPOILS of their country. When this party again united to their former opponents—resumed the helm in times of peace and content, what hope of expelling them could remain to the youthful statesman? Obviously none! except by the people's aid. But disgusted as they were with this union of opposite parties, it should seem unlikely that discontents should, at that time of peace and renewed prosperity, rise to any effectual height: a reform, a *real* reform of parliament, then presented itself to his longing mind, as the only certain step to power and profit. It was indeed an evil to him as a Minister, but a Minister he had no other chance to become. Quickighted to his object, he immediately formed his resolution, and standing forth the advocate of the people's rights, his exertions to attain them

them were perhaps at that moment sincere*. But when, by the imprudent boldness of Mr. Fox's India Bill, united to the disgust occasioned by his coalition with his former opponent, and by the decided manner in which Mr. Pitt had declared himself for a compleat parliamentary reform, at a time of life which forbid the nation to suspect him of being hacknied in state duplicity, her hopes were fixed upon him; and he was called and hailed into office, as the expected saviour of his country. When this was done, the case was ALTERED! the bird was caught! the same principles which before induced him to enforce, now made it his object—to prevent a parliamentary reform. But the case was not easy—the decisive steps by which he had endeavoured to promote it, made the task of preventing it peculiarly difficult to him. Hence, the obvious necessity of his intrenching himself behind new works—of increasing influence, and diverting the attention of the people from their own concerns, by a foreign war—to afford a plea for calling upon them to strengthen the hands of government against the common enemy, and representing the advocates for reform as the emissaries of this enemy, and sparing neither fraud nor force to intimidate and annihilate them. Hence, persecutions for SEDITION and HIGH TREASON against those who follow the measures he publicly recommended and set on foot, for procuring a reform in parliament. Nevertheless, the commencement of his career was splendid: the nation confiding in his integrity and abilities, public credit was increased; the convulsed state of foreign countries

* However, this is by no means certain; it seems more probable, that by proposing a plan of reform more extensive, than that of Mr. Fox, it was the object to insure his opposition, and that of his coadjutors; and thus, throwing the odium of the miscarriage upon that party, receive the merit of the intention.

gave us superior advantages: a spirit of industry was raised, and our trade was extended to a degree beyond expectation. The revenue being in proportion increased, the public confidence was confirmed, and the people acquiesced with alacrity in whatever their reputed redeemer required. He new modified and increased the existing taxes, and laying on new ones, he announced his intention to pay off the debts of the nation. The plans of the ablest financiers were collected, and their merits assumed as his own. From Dr. Price he received three communications; they were unacknowledged; but one of them, the least efficient, was adopted*. From this circumstance, it seems, that even in those early days, he was not unversed in the conduct of becoming a statesman; indeed, to his ready conception of this kind of state management, it seems not unlikely, he owed the title of the "Heaven-born Minister," *i. e.* he was born a statesman, formed by nature to practise the manœuvres of state, by which he has since so eminently distinguished himself, more especially in compassing the present war, which I now attempt to trace from its source†.

France, having established the constitution of 1789, was literally in a state of profound peace, and internal tranquillity: there were differences of opinion in the constitutional assembly, as there have ever been in the English Parliament, and they were as freely expressed and debated upon; and there were consequently some who wished to re-establish despotic power, as there may perhaps now be in England. Things were in this state, and the first Assembly still sitting, when, in July 1791, a cir-

* Considerations on the Causes and Alarming consequences of the present war. Jordan, 1794.

† An Impartial History of the Revolution in France, containing some real authenticated matters of Fact, not yet generally known, &c.

cular letter was addressed from Padua, by the Emperor, to all the powers of Europe, calling upon them to interfere in the affairs of France: France, nevertheless, being occupied with her own affairs, continued tranquil, and chose rather to try the result of negotiation, than to be precipitated into a war however just. Consequently, upon this, towards the close of that summer, a convention was held at PILNITZ in Saxony, between the Emperor and King of Prussia in person, and the ambassadors from other states. A treaty was then entered into, which was at that time studiously concealed, but it has since been discovered, that the following were the conditions agreed upon:

TREATY OF PILNITZ.

“ His Majesty, the Emperor, will retake all that
 “ Lou's XIV. conquered in the Austrian Netherlands;
 “ and uniting these provinces to the said Netherlands,
 “ will give them to his Serene Highness the Elector Pa-
 “ latine, so that these new possessions, added to the
 “ Palatinate, may hereafter have the name of Austrasia.

“ His Majesty the Emperor, will preserve for ever,
 “ the property and possession of Bavaria, to make in fu-
 “ ture, an indivisible mass, with the domains and heri-
 “ ditary possessions of the House of Austria.

“ Her Serene Highness, the Archduchess, Maria
 “ Christiana, shall be conjointly with his Serene High-
 “ ness, her nephew, the Archduke Charles, put into he-
 “ reditary possession of the Duchy of Lorraine.

“ Alsace shall be restored to the Empire: and the Bishop
 “ of Straßburg, as well as the Chapter, shall recover
 “ their ancient privileges: and the ecclesiastical sove-
 “ reigns of Germany shall do the same.

“ If

“ If the Swiss Cantons consent and accede to the coalition, it may be proposed to them, to annex to the Helvetic League, the Bishopric of Potentrui, the desfiles of Franche Compté, and even those of Tyrol, with the neighbouring bailiwicks, as well as the territory of Verfoy, which intersects the Pays de Vaud.

“ Should his Majesty, the King of Sardinia, subscribe to the coalition, la Poreffe, le Pugey, and le Pays de Gex, usurped by France from Savoy, shall be restored to him.

“ In case his Sardinian Majesty can make a grand diversion, he shall be suffered to take Dauphiny, to belong to him for ever, as the nearest descendant of the ancient Dauphins.

“ His Majesty, the King of Spain, shall have Roussillon and Bearn, with the island of Corsica, and he shall take possession of the French part of St. Domingo.

“ Her Majesty, the Empress of all the Russias, shall take upon herself the invasion of Poland, and, at the same time retain Kaminieck, with that part of Padolia which borders on Moldavia.

“ His Majesty, the Emperor, will oblige the Porte to give up Choczim, as well as the small forts of Servia, and those of the river Luma.

“ His Majesty, the King of Prussia, by means of the above-mentioned invasion of the Empress of all the Russias into Poland, shall make an acquisition of Thorn and Dantzic, and there unite the palatinate on the East to the confines of Silesia.

“ His Majesty, the King of Prussia, shall besides acquire Lusace; and his Serene Highness the Elector of Saxony, shall, in exchange, receive the rest of Poland, and occupy the throne as hereditary sovereign.

“ His

" His Majesty, the present King of Poland, shall abdicate the throne, on receiving a suitable annuity.

" His Serene Highness the Elector of Saxony, shall give his daughter in marriage to his Royal Highness, the youngest son of his Royal Highness the Grand Duke of all the Russias, who will be the father of the hereditary Kings of Poland and Lithuania.

" LEOPOLD,

" PRINCE NASSAU,

" COUNT FLORIDA BLANCA.

" BISCHOFFWERDER."

That a Treaty of such a nature should be studiously concealed until the time of carrying it into effect, cannot be doubted; and even after it has become known, it is not likely it should be openly avowed, especially by the king of Prussia, under whose immediate auspices and guarantee that Government had been established in Poland which it is here agreed to overturn. If I may hazard a conjecture, it is that Russia and Prussia having determined upon dividing Poland anew, engaged to the House of Austria, as the condition of her acquiescence, to assist her in gaining possession of Bavaria, and certain provinces of France; and the better to accomplish this, it was proposed to divide the force, and weaken the resistance of the latter, by inducing the Swiss Cantons, the King of Sardinia, the King of Spain, and any other powers that were so inclined, to attack her also, and seize such provinces as bordered upon their respective countries. It is understood, however, that the King of Spain afterwards renounced this treaty, and it is, on the other hand, reported that the King of England acceded to it in March 1792: it seems to give weight to these reports that the *latter* has taken possession of Corsica, and other parts of the French Dominions, which were by this treaty

treaty originally allotted to the *former*. Another circumstance which gives credit to them, is the different conduct of the sovereigns at the time when the life of the unfortunate Louis hung in suspense. The Spanish Monarch then made a noble exertion to save it, offering on that condition to acknowledge the French Republic, and use all his interest with his Allies to prevail on them to do the same; while on the other hand, our Sovereign, however distressing to his humanity was the execution of that unfortunate King, did not make any attempt to prevent it; but on the contrary, by threatening France with war at the precise time, seemed likely to make his death certain, by inflaming the minds of the people: a conduct which we shall find it difficult to reconcile with the declared virtues of so excellent a prince, except by imputing it to his rigid adherence to the faith of treaties, and to his being engaged by that of PILNITZ, to unite in the invasion of France.

Holland is said to have afterwards acceded to it, and her having done so was, I believe, asserted by General Dumourier, and urged to the Convention when he requested their permission to invade her: but as they refused to permit it, they certainly were unacquainted with the fact, and gave no credit to it. Neither does it appear that France believed our Sovereign to be a party to it; on the contrary, she seemed to confide in his assistance to counteract its effect. This does not seem surprising, for when the King of Prussia united his forces to those of Austria, they issued a joint manifesto, in which they avowed their intention of establishing the former despotic government, and declared, * “The convention of
“PILNITZ determined those circumstances which made

* Manifesto, &c. printed for Ridgeway. 1792. Page 17.

“ their

" their Imperial and Royal Majesties have recourse to
 " arms,"—they concealed the intention of dismembering
 France, and on the contrary said, " * But yielding to
 " what the honor of all Crowns, and the real interests
 " of all people requires, THEIR MAJESTIES *declare to*
 " EUROPE *that, in the just war which they have un-*
 " *dertaken, they entertain no view of personal aggran-*
 " *dizement, WHICH THEY EXPRESSLY RENOUNCE.*"

France therefore, being thus prevented from suspecting their real intentions, thought it yet possible to avert the miseries of war by negociation, and in that hope, she requested the mediation of our sovereign in a memorial delivered by their ambassador to Lord Grenville, dated 18th June 1792. His Majesty's weight in the scale of Europe, and especially his intimate connection with the Prussian Court, left little room to doubt the success of his mediation: his declared love of peace, and disinterested affection for his people, to whom the continuance of the general tranquillity was so eminently advantageous—the valuable treaty of commerce they enjoyed with France, which had gained such credit to the abilities of his Ministers—the moral certainty that war would destroy this treaty—the honorable confidence in his virtues which France expressed in the offer, left little room to doubt that he would embrace the enviable occasion—but it is certain that his Majesty, not only if a party, but even if merely privy and assenting to the treaty of PRITZ, could not, with perfect propriety, interpose to prevent the carrying it into effect. Yet as Kings in general, and those in alliance with our Sovereign in particular, do by their prerogative, lay claim to a discretionary power of not adhering more strictly to the faith of

* Manifestos, &c. printed for Ridgeway. 1792. Page 36.

Treaties than is convenient to themselves; how is it to be regretted that the exercise of this power was by the too rigid virtue of a Sovereign so unlike his Allies evaded—in perhaps the only instance in which the use of it would have been beneficial, and have prevented every misery and every crime that have ensued on the continent, and the more alarming evils which now hang portentous over this late so happy land—happy in the possession—happy in the expected duration of liberty, security, property, active industry, and peace.

After this refusal of our Sovereign to mediate, came the manifestos of the Duke of Brunswick, dated 25th and 27th July, 1792: in these it is declared, that “the two allied Courts have no other object in view than the welfare of France*”—“they simply intend to deliver the King, the Queen, and the Royal Family from their captivity;” and “their Imperial and Royal Majesties further declare on their faith and word, as Emperor and King, that if the palace of the Tuilleries be forced or insulted—if the least violence be offered, the least outrage done to their Majesties, the King, the Queen, and the Royal Family—if they be not immediately placed in safety, and set at liberty, they will inflict upon those who shall deserve it, the most exemplary and ever memorable avenging punishments, by giving up the city of Paris to Military Execution, and exposing it to total destruction”†. These Manifestoes being become public at Paris, the nation was in a ferment. Their King *was* at liberty! They believed him to have been sincere when he accepted the Constitution, and notwithstanding he had since had the weakness to recede from his engagements, they

* Manifestos, page 40.

† Manifestos, page 42.

imputed it to ill advisers, and not to himself; and voluntarily restored him to the Throne he had clearly forfeited, by breach of the conditions on which he held it.—They restored him to the throne, and to the free exercise of kingly powers. That he conceived himself free—that he acted not contrary to his own judgment through fear of the National Assembly, or the people of Paris—we have an unequivocal proof. At this very time of alarm, when hostile armies were advancing for the avowed purpose of levelling the City in ruins, he refused his consent to the raising an army in its defence!!!

What King would have manifested more clearly that he was not—that he did not think he was—under restraint? The Imperial Nero, when he sent forth his emissaries to set on fire the metropolis of his Empire, while he contemplated from the capitol the brilliancy of the flames, did not manifest a stronger faith in the obedient spirit of his subjects—neither did he experience it: the refractory Romans did all they could to prevent their city from being consumed; as the rebellious Parisians raised an army to prevent the sacking of their city. From this time indeed they no longer put confidence in their King; neither does it appear that the Roman people confided in their Emperors in any great degree—Yet who, in these days of Divine Right shall presume to think that Nero did wrong?—if any do, they will not be inclined to deny, that Louis also, though I am persuaded that he acted from mistaken motives, and was misled by interested and unprincipled advisers, was, by the concurrence of circumstances*, liable to strong, and almost conclusive

* The meetings of the noted Austrian Committee at Paris, during the summer of 1792, till the 10th of August, changed the face of things, were as regular, and as well known to the public, as the meeting at the Cabinet Council at St. James's.—Considerations on the Causes, &c. Jordan. 1794.

suspicion of treason, and of acting in concert with the invaders of his country.—The transactions of the 10th of August were the result: from thence a suspicion had gone forth, that certain parties among the citizens had conspired to deliver the country into the hands of the invaders: hence arose the horrors of the 3d and 4th Sept.—the innocent and the guilty were involved in one confusion, and fell victims to the temporary tyranny of anarchy. But so far is it from being true, that the executions of September 1792, indicate the ferocious disposition of Frenchmen in general, that the English travellers, who were in Paris at the time, declare, that the whole massacre was perpetrated by not more than fifty persons. It will be considered as disgraceful to the public, that such barbarities are not resisted: but those who recollect the riots in London in 1780, will acknowledge that there is in all large bodies an astonishing torpor, which prevent them from resisting the violence of a desperate banditti, till compelled by the urgent necessity of self-defence.—In the present case, either such conspiracies were really formed, or the charge was fabricated: if the plots existed, what wonder that the dregs of the people, by whom these terrors were executed, were wrought on by their malicious and designing leaders, to fury and desperation; and in the eagerness to take vengeance on those that had conspired their ruin, should involve the suspected with the really guilty. If the charge was fabricated, great was the guilt of the fabricators; but the influence of the fabrication on the minds of the populace, whom it deceived, was in proportion to that of the reality. In a time like that could nice discrimination be adopted? When life and every thing which can render it a blessing are at stake, is calm and impartial justice to be expected from the lowest of mankind? If we contrast these

these effects of the sudden alarm and threatened ruin among uninformed Frenchmen, with the attacks of Church and King mobs at Birmingham and Manchester, and the deliberate studied prosecutions sustained by SUBORNATION OF PERJURY*, and aimed, in times of internal quiet, and, as our legislators informs us, of prosperity, at the lives of men whose only crime it is to have copied the example set by Mr. Pitt and the Duke of Richmond, in promoting the taking the sense of the people at large, in respect to a reform of Parliament;—when we contrast these, we shall perhaps find little room for exultation, that our laws are not administered by an Egalité and a Marat!

After the massacres of the 3d and 4th September, the storm subsided in the capital, and the people directed their efforts against the invading armies with alternate success. The next link in the chain of events, leading to our present situation, appears to have been the part taken by the Elector of Hanover, whose Envoy, Monsieur Knobel, going to the petty courts of Germany, made use of his master's influence and name to excite them to send their respective quotas of troops to act against France. This was made known to the national convention on the 15th September, by the minister for foreign affairs, who at the same time observed, that the addition of the Elector of Hanover to the list of their enemies need not alarm them, so long as the King of England maintained his neutrality—which he had declared his strict determination to do. After this France compelled the invaders to retreat, and following close at their heels, the Austrian Netherlands became the seat of war, and by the victory of Jemappe, fell the easy, and apparently

* See Walker's Trial.

the willing, conquest of the victors; a willing conquest it appears, since they attempted no resistance, and their discontent at the reiterated breaches of faith they had experienced from the House of Austria—strong only to oppress, impotent to protect!—was well known, and had so recently as the year burst into open resistance, even when hopeless of any foreign aid: it is improbable, however, that they were unanimous in the wish to be incorporated into the government of France:—neither the Clergy nor the Aristocracy could greatly desire it. Her doctrine, that the revenues of the Church were at the disposal of the state, and that great temporal power and luxury are not the necessary appendages of a religion, whose Founder has expressly declared, that “his kingdom is not of this world”—these doctrines would not be pleasing to the rich and powerful clergy of the Netherlands: neither would the other privileged orders wish for the abolition of their exclusive privileges, or approve of the doctrine, that the poor shall enjoy the same protection of the law as themselves. However, it was proposed in the convention, and, after some hesitation, was decreed—That France should wish to weaken a power which had avowed (though not to the full extent) its hostile views towards her, none can feel surprise; nor can any blame her for seeking, at the expence of that power, to strengthen and indemnify herself; but how far she was from, at that time, having it in contemplation to aggrandize herself at the expence of her *neutral* neighbours, however inviting the object, and however safe the attempt, her conduct on that occasion afforded no doubtful proof. Not having foreseen, nor prepared to resist, the powerful invasion of the Duke of Brunswick, she had recourse to an expedient for that purpose, which the event has justified: she made a public declaration; “Citizens,

izens, the Country is in danger; we do not call upon you as slaves—subject to blows, whipping, * and all the despotism of military law, to devote your lives to glut the ambition and the avarice of a tyrant—to enslave, and to plunder other nations—No! we call upon you as citizens, to come forward in your own defence—the defence of your invaded country—your country relieved; we demand no more, that done—return at will to your peaceful occupations.” The call was heard! the enemy was repulsed! and the battle of Jemappe changed the sovereignty of the Netherlands.

Then it was, that their General Dumourier urged to them the policy of making use of the opportunity, that then offered for securing Holland; the government of which being closely connected with the powers with whom they were at war, might be influenced to take a part in it, and to turn her force against them, if not timely prevented. The Convention could not but see the force of these arguments, but knowing that it was not the interest of the people in Holland, to take a part, they declined to make the attack, chusing rather to hazard whatever consequences might follow: the loss of such an opportunity, than to deviate even in appearance from the principle of “renouncing aggressive war,” by attacking a power whose hostile intentions towards them, they had not completely ascertained. Accordingly, rejecting Dumourier’s proposition, they permitted the disbanding of their victorious army—by a public declaration, referring to the cause for which they had been assembled, and the danger of their country, and declaring that it no longer existed. “Citizens! the country is no longer in danger. The object of your toils is attained—we no longer call

* This Prussian part of discipline however was little practised in France, even under the despotic government.

upon you for military service ; enjoy in peace and security the fruits of your patriotic exertions." Nevertheless, the Convention manifested at one time a disposition to depart from this rigid adherence to their principle of engaging in no war, but of self defence, namely, when, on the 19th of November, they passed a decree, that France would assist all nations that should wish to recover their liberties: if the word liberty was in no danger of being misapplied, the decree would have manifested nothing but a generous zeal for the happiness of mankind ; but this was too much to be expected, it was certainly rash and unjustifiable, so far as it related to powers who had no hostile views against herself, namely, Denmark, Sweden, and the Swiss Cantons. And these, it must be admitted, are included in the word " all ;" but it does not appear to have raised any alarm in them. With regard to her enemies, it certainly does not go beyond the common usages of kings : thus, our Elizabeth assisted the revolted provinces of the Netherlands, to emancipate themselves from the dominion of Spain ; and she, also, in time of peace, fomented discontents in Scotland, whose queen she afterwards put to death. But in the present state of France, this decree may be regarded in the light of a defensive measure ; the same powers confederated to attack her, being also combined against Poland and other States. What could be so natural or so justifiable, as for her to hold out to these States, her willingness to make a common cause with them, against those who had made a common cause against her : yet, as at that time, no hostile intentions on the part of England had been avowed, for the refusal of her king to oppose the invasion of France by Austria and Prussia, and the endeavours of the Elector of Hanover to render that invasion effectual, must not be so construed ; this might be considered by her as a just ground
of

of complaint: the conduct to be pursued on this occasion seemed obvious; namely, to have demanded, either that the decree in question should be rescinded, or limited to those powers who avowed an intention of interfering in the internal government of France. But this was disdained! yet the solicitude of France to conciliate the English government, induced her, in answer to the general invectives of administration—unasked—to declare, that it was not, nor ever could be her intention to encourage a faction in opposition to the established government, or general sense of any people; and that she would shew that respect to the rights of other nations which she laid claim to, from them, for her own. Since the explanation was voluntarily entered into by the French Minister for foreign affairs, if it was not satisfactory it would be hard to say, why ministers did not reply, and state pacifically what would be so; did we not know, not only that the Elector of Hanover had before taken a decisive part in the confederacy against France, but also, that the British minister has now acknowledged (what his measures have all along manifested beyond the possibility of a doubt, though he persisted to deny it at the time) that the war is carried on for the express purpose of interfering in the internal government of France, and wresting provinces from her, under the title of indemnification. It has appeared, that this intended dismemberment was expressly denied in the manifesto of our Imperial and Royal Allies; but it was in effect begun when Valenciennes was taken possession of, not for Louis the XVIIth, but for his Imperial Majesty: and has been, in like manner, continued by our gracious sovereign in Corsica, and the East and West Indies.

But as Paine, an approver of the Government of France, is avowedly inimical to that of England, it is
thence

thence argued, that the government he approves, must also be hostile to us: that it is different from ours, is admitted, and that some who approve the one may dislike the other: but, if upon grounds like this, nations are to make war upon each other, every nation must be at war incessantly, with all her neighbours, and they all at war with each other; (a true war of extermination!) since it may be questioned, whether there do now, or ever did exist, any two governments in the universe perfectly alike, or ever less unlike each other than those of France and England, according to the known principles of the constitution; however either of them may deviate from those principles in practice. The constitution of France being printed, and the principles of our constitution laid down in Mr. Lock's Essay on Government, in the Bill of Rights, the Habeas Corpus act, &c. &c., the comparison may be made easy, and the fact ascertained. The deviations from our constitution then are what give weight to the censures of Paine; he may assert, that we have no constitution if it is not exemplified in practice; but he does not want to reform abuses, he wants to overturn the constitution—he wants to force a Republic upon us—it may be so; but was he the aggressor? it is well known that he was not—that Mr. Burke first stepped forth the Knight Errant of Aristocracy and Despotism, and assailed the United Monarchy of France. This act of a man pensioned—largely pensioned by the British administration, might not, indeed, be imputed to that spirit of chivalry alone, which he, so highly admires—might not France, without illiberality, construe it as a symptom, that British administration was not friendly? and might not ministers, therefore, knowing that she had no reason to confide in them, judge of her views, by their own, and
place

place her forbearance and moderation, to account of artifice and fear.

Mr. Burke did this long before the treaty of PILNITZ took place, and perhaps thereby gave it birth; for it seems unlikely that the conspirators there, would have dared to provoke the resentment of France, unless secure of the approval and support of the British Government. As to the motives of Mr. Burke's conduct, I will hazard a conjecture: at the time of that humiliating calamity which befel the sovereign, when the party, of which he was a member, urged the right of the Prince of Wales to the Regency, this gentleman was particularly confident, and spoke with a seeming exultation of the sovereign's misfortune. When, therefore, his unexpected restoration put an end to the hopes of that party, and the natural joy which it occasioned, convinced him of the strength of the present administration, may not the recollection of his intemperate language have put him in just fear for the continuance of his pension; and may not he have been threatened with its abolition, if he did not come over to the party in power, and do some effectual service to their cause?

But I have heard it said, that Mr. Burke is a well meaning man, and possessed of humanity: if so, another motive must be found for his conduct—this is found, if he is a Roman Catholic: I have heard this intimated, and it is certain, that many well meaning men have been of that persuasion. Now, it is well known, that by the tenets of the church of Rome, it is lawful to do any action, of which the intent is good: and that all heretics and unbelievers are condemned to everlasting damnation; and the sword and the stake are the prescribed means of their conversion: therefore, against heretics, it is lawful and commendable to use them. In illustration of
its

its legality, there is high authority. That excellent queen, Mary, illustrated it by practice in England. Charles the IXth, proved it still more conspicuously in France, in the massacre of St. Bartholemew: Louis the XIVth, dra-gooned the protestants with equal activity: and James the IIId. in England, manifested an equal zeal, until checked in his progress by the Revolution. Now at present, the French and English Nations are alike heretics; so I believe, are the Prussians, and most of the German States: to a true Catholic, therefore, the destruction of them all is equally just and meritorious: and in this light, their being pitted against each other, is a truly pious work. But I, not being a Catholic, may be permitted to confess that to me, it does not appear, either necessary or desirable, that antipathies should be excited between nation and nation, or between man and man. I do not perceive any antipathy in animal nature: that between the dog and cat is proverbial, yet it has no existence: where benevolence directs the family œconomy, no such antipathy appears: the dog, by nature, inclines to hunt and drive before him, any kind of animal, but being discouraged, he as readily associates with the cat, as with his own species: in the cat, there is no other antipathy, but the antipathy of fear. The force of this passion to raise antipathies—to mislead the judgment, and to interdict reflection, seems to have been but too well understood by our eagle eyed Legislators, and but too successfully made trial of; by alarming us with the apprehension of innovations in the constitution, they have effected the reality—the constitution seems no longer to exist! So late as the trial of Paine, the Bill of Rights was declared by one of the conservators of our law—the Attorney General, to be so excellent, that to comment upon, to attempt to elucidate it, was profanation: he
would

would "not profane it with a comment." But where is now this Bill of Rights? where, but in the memory of a passed dream!

I have either read or dreamt that it is declared in this Bill of Rights, Article 8. "That all elections of Members of Parliament ought to be free." Art. 10. "That excessive bail ought not to be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel nor unusual punishment inflicted." Art. 5. "That it is the right of the subject to petition the King; and all commitments and prosecutions for such petitioning are illegal. But I now hear from an authority *, sanctioned with the approbation of our rulers—sanctioned, not with a tacit acquiescence, but with the unequivocal testimony of a pension, and the public recommendation of Mr. Reeves, and his disinterested coadjutors; that "corrupt majorities," are "intimately "interwoven with our practical freedom," and that members of parliament "ought NEVER to be considered "as the representatives of the people," and "have produced the happiness of this country, by NOT speaking "the will of the people." Under the same sanction, we are taught, that to petition, (to associate or meet together, for the purpose of framing petitions) for redress of grievances, ought, by act of parliament, to be declared to be illegal: where then is the right of the subject to petition? If excessive bail was illegal, why was Lord George Gordon, after the expiration of his sentence, detained in Newgate for life, by the manœuvre of requiring of him 10,000*l.* bail, when his property was nothing at all? And why was Eaton, the bookseller, by the same manœuvre, of requiring 2,000*l.* bail, and procrastinating his trial, detained in Newgate many months, on a charge obviously trivial, and of which he was acquitted when brought to

* Mr. Arthur Younge, recommended by Mr. Reeves's association.

trial? And if cruel and unusual punishments ought not to be inflicted, by what rule are the illustrious convicts in Scotland condemned to transportation, among felons, for fourteen years, for having persevered in the steps first set on foot by those now in power, when candidates for the good opinion and support of the people, and which they did not deem it unseasonable to attempt carrying into effect, even at a time of internal insurrection, the Duke of Richmond having at that very time, on the 2d June, 1780, when a lawless mob were besieging the doors of Parliament, and maltreating many of its Members, brought in his bill for universal suffrage and annual Parliaments, as the best means of quieting the tempest of popular insurrection.

That we are threatened with the total loss of that Constitution which has produced all the property we enjoy, might of itself be thought sufficient to alarm, to rouse an English heart: but if the excess of influence—if hopes of participating in the spoil, has so absorbed every honourable sentiment that we can look at the annihilation of our dearest rights with indifference, another consideration remains, which cannot be thought on without some effect. France occupied at once in civil regulations, and in resisting the armies both of invaders and of internal malecontents, confiding too in the professed neutrality of England, neglected her navy. When war took place, we secured or destroyed at Toulon no small proportion of her fleet; yet she has already been able to meet us on the ocean, on almost as equal a footing as she did in the American war, when our force was divided, and employed also against Spain, Holland, and America! yet no expence has been spared, no demand of the Ministry rejected, for the purpose of increasing our naval force! If France, thus situated, has so gained upon us in naval exertions, what may

we

we not apprehend, if peace taking place between her and the continental powers, she unites both the navy and the materials for ship building in Holland to her own; and devotes all or half her exertions to her fleet? May it not be apprehended that she will be in another year superior to us on the ocean? We may accuse the Dutch of supineness and timidity, because they manifest no zeal in their opposition to the army of France; but we well know that they have been compelled, and engaged most unwillingly in a war diametrically opposed to their dearest interest. France was the mart of their produce, and her increasing prosperity would have increased theirs (as it would ours too), nor can their commerce with England compensate them in any degree for being deprived of that of France. They never willingly engage in any war, but by being compelled to it, we have experienced on the Dogger Bank that they have not lost their national courage; and not having the option of neutrality, there is no room to question that they will now range on the side of France.

In such a state of things France having, over and above what she may want to guard her Frontiers, several hundred thousand troops seasoned in the present campaign, left without employ by the retreat of her continental enemies, what remains to prevent her from landing them in this country? We are told that they cannot do it, but let us not deceive ourselves; we were never before engaged against an ARMED NATION; a people, who, however divided in opinion as to their form of government, are unanimous in their determination to resist the interference of foreign powers, and to resent the attempts of England, by starving them, to excite discontents and internal insurrections. That they have the will to retaliate upon us, they do not conceal. Let us then no longer persist to shut our eyes upon the dangers that encircle

circle us. It was not the superiority of our fleet, it was the necessity of turning all her efforts to repel her continental invaders, which disabled her from pouring an army into England this campaign. I have heard it reported, as the opinion of naval and military officers, that it would be a work of considerable time to disembark an army of 40,000 men, with their artillery and baggage, even if they experienced no opposition. This is certainly true when large shipping are employed, and the artillery, &c. stowed in the holds; but a small vessel, which may transport from the opposite coast 100 men, with their artillery, &c. might be unloaded by its crew within an hour or two; and 500 such vessels might, by the same rule, unload in the same time. The first forty or fifty thousand may intrench themselves upon the coast, until another embarkation arrives; should our fleet maintain its present superiority, it cannot prevent this*: Nieuport, Ostend, Antwerp, and the United Provinces, seconding the views of France, how are we to resist this invasion of a people conceiving themselves injured by us, and panting to retaliate? And what encouragement do our rulers afford us to expect a different turn of fortune, when we were informed from the Throne, at the opening of Parliament, that the last had been a fortunate campaign, although our splendid successes had been followed with the same consequences as defeats! repulsed before Dunkirk—driven out of Toulon, and our Allies on the Rhine, after having COMPLETELY ROUTED the French in the morning, compelled by this routed army to surrender their lives the same afternoon†. If these were the events of a campaign, declared to be fortunate from the Throne, what may we not apprehend, if the fickle

* See Gazette Dec. 1793.

Goddef's goes over to the other side. Is there no danger that we may be reduced vainly to solicit peace, on terms which we might now honourably offer? "To err is human," to retract when we perceive our error, is the mark of a liberal and enlightened mind. It is now known that we were deceived—that the insurrections which were declared from the throne to have been excited in this country by France, never had existence—that our allies, at the treaty of PILNITZ, pre-concerted the invasion of France, as themselves have avowed in their manifestos, long before France declared war. That France, far from wishing to overturn the government of Great Britain, confided in it to the degree of requesting the mediation of our Sovereign—of offering to submit to his equity the circumstances of her dispute with Austria and Prussia—that this being refused, she had no alternative but war—that when victorious over the invaders she stopped short, and would not consent to the proposal of her General, Dumourier, to invade Holland, until threatened with war by England,—that she still endeavoured to avert it, by negociation, and sent over full powers to her ambassador for that purpose; and though the direct breach of our Treaties with her, the corn bound to her ports had been stopped, and the Alien Bill passed, did not desist until he was ordered to quit the country, and a war establishment was voted by the British Parliament. That the French Convention having declared that war subsisted between the two Countries on these accounts, the British Minister represented the war as unprovoked and unsought by him, although he has since confessed that his object is, what he was at that time charged with and denied, to interfere in the internal government of France; and that he thinks the worst disasters preferable to a peace, until that government is

D

changed.

changed. In this opinion he may be sincere, since that government, having experienced his duplicity, would perhaps refuse to treat while he continues in administration, and require his dismissal as an earnest of our sincerity. He may too determine to continue the war for another motive, more pardonable in him, but not less fatal to us, the dread of investigation, and of consequent condign punishment. That this nation would contentedly see him retain his sinecure places, is not likely: this conclusion I think the public voice would require; but this done, that it should continue implacable against him, is unnatural: for those that have suffered alone, and not done an injury, may harbour a temporary resentment, they are usually mollified by the first concession; and it is the man who has committed an aggression that cherishes a continued hatred to the party he has injured, because he dreads the resentment he is conscious of meriting. From this motive a minister may think "the worst disasters;" may think foreign invasion and internal war, preferable to peace: but as our gracious sovereign can have no such inducement—as he can have no wish contrary to the interest of his people, it may be hoped that he, if France makes such a requisition, will not refuse compliance, nor, on that account, defer to negotiate, until we are compelled to what we may now voluntarily, and therefore creditably, adopt. Since the expectation of conquest can no longer be indulged, and since negotiation must finally take place, to what purpose is the effusion of blood to be prolonged?—It has appeared that the war was unsought by France, that England, and her Allies, were the Aggressors. It will then be a wise and honourable policy, to acknowledge that we have been deceived—to let concession and restitution be our own voluntary act, and not to procrastinate them until they are compelled

compelled from us by invasion and national bankruptcy. Let us acknowledge the French Republic in manly and explicit terms; and by making a tender of full and complete restitution of what we have gained from her, as the price of peace, prove that we are not actuated by the desire of plunder, nor parties to the confederacy against the rights of nations at PILNITZ.

That ministers should talk of keeping Corsica, and the French East and West Indian settlements, by way of indemnification for the expences incurred, is not surprising: this species of indemnification is indeed most valuable to them. Their accession of patronage, and consequent increase of influence, by the appointment of Governors, Lieutenant Governors, Attorney General, Chief Justices, Naval and Military Offices, is no less obvious, than is the burden, which all these appointments intail upon the independant part of the community: the occasions to which foreign conquests afford, of engaging a nation in war, may be no little benefit to its rulers, but it is now known, that they do not increase national prosperity; that free commerce with distant countries is more beneficial in its effects, than the exercise of sovereignty, and the produce of our West Indian Islands would come to us upon much easier terms, if every island was declared independant. In short, whatever advantages may accrue to ministers, by the possession of the conquests gained—to us, the only important benefit they can produce, will be to purchase us a safe and honorable peace, and liberate us from the perplexity in which we are involved. But there are, who urge, that France will not now consent to peace with us, and that we shall be humiliated in making an offer which may be rejected with contempt. As I see this argument repeatedly urged in those authentic journals, which are devoted to the advocates of

the war, I cannot but suspect the sincerity. It should seem, that these gentlemen would rather fear, that conciliatory proposals should be accepted, than that they should be refused; but should this happen, what will be the consequence? The ruling powers of England, in soliciting a peace on equitable terms, will at once proclaim to France, and their own people, their moderation, their justice, and their regard to the lives and interests of the people. The French rulers, in refusing it, would make it appear, that they were actuated by different motives, and alienate the people from their standard. It is well known, that the decree of the 19th Nov. which afforded a pretext for the interference of England, was fatal to its authors—was made the leading accusation against them, and perished with them in the grave. The present leaders, therefore, however they may cabal against each other, are not likely to hazard any act contrary to the known interest of the nation. But, which is improbable, should passion prevail over prudence, and the people indignant at seeing how England has taken the lead among their enemies, and determine upon invading us, is it not obvious, that our having offered them equitable terms of peace, will prevent them from being unanimous in this determination—will make their attack less vigorous and formidable, and on the other hand, will tend to strengthen our resistance, and prevent us from imputing to the pertinacious obstinacy of our rulers, the evils which threaten us, confirm our attachment to our constitution, and conciliate us to the existing government? This subject requires some further consideration. It may be hoped, that France will consent to any liberal plan of accommodation: but if misled by passion, she determines upon invading us, and overthrowing that government which has been the soul of the confederacy against her,

the

the consequences may be truly alarming. How are we prepared to resist the attack of an armed nation, by a MILITIA RANK AND FILE OF PROPERTY? * the rich pitted against the poor? the poor thrown out of employ, and compelled through desperate necessity, to engage in a naval or military life; their wives and children—now, perhaps widows and orphans—the parish rates unequal to their sustenance, with difficulty subsisted by the subscriptions, which fills the columns of newspapers, and our resources failing, in proportion as our exigencies increase. The rich clubbed together, to resist the reform of abuses, the advocates for the rights of the people, and the true principles of the constitution, persecuted, accused of sedition, and high treason, and the doctrines of passive obedience, and non resistance revived and enforced! the free discussion of political subjects suppressed by every possible means:—Do not these measures testify that our rulers themselves are convinced of the unpopularity of their system, and that the more it is known, the more it will be depreciated and opposed? And is it in such a situation, that we provoke the invasion of a powerful and united people—or do we confide upon the mercenary troops of Hanover, Austria, Prussia and Russia, to preserve to us the constitution that we love? a constitution the reverse of their own, and which they have ever looked on with a jealous and an envious eye. I appeal to those of my countrymen, yet undebauched by court systems, uncorrupted by ministerial influence—who do not look for plenteous tables, supplied at the cost of their hungry fellow citizens—to those, who living independantly upon their paternal estates, upon the fruit of their own exertions, which were secured to them by the English constitution—love that constitution—to these, I appeal,

* Recommended by Mr. Arthur Young.

whether

whether we have not within our reach a more effectual and a less dangerous means of defence—Englishmen alone can defend the English Constitution—present then, to them, the constitution pure—such as it is defined to be—and they will have an interest in defending it—let them see—let them feel the excellence of the constitution—remove the abuses which have suppressed—which threaten to annihilate it—to the belief that we are free, that we shall continue to be free—to enjoy the fruit of our labours, we owe all the exertions of individuals; all that has made us the admiration and the envy of surrounding nations—confirm then, this belief—do not destroy it; afford to the poor the prospect of acquiring property—they will then respect property—do not combine the receivers of pensions against the greater number who must pay them, nor think, by telling these last, that they are happy, to prevent them from feeling that they are miserable—restore then the constitution! what that constitution is the Bill of Rights sufficiently declares; “All elections of members of parliament ought to be free,” and “frequent.” Such parliaments will remove all lesser abuses. Ministers may confide in the strong phalanx of placemen and pensioners, which has an interest in supporting their measures—and while these are secure of their reward, the confidence may be not unfounded. But should this security fail—should the people shew strong symptoms of discontent, the same principle which induced their support, will justify their desertion, and punishment may follow. This is an argument which must be felt by men in power—may it be regarded!—they will then not need to depend upon foreign mercenaries, nor is there any danger that France should be covetous of war, or refuse equitable terms of peace tendered by a united people.

I will now only add, that as in the above I have made

use

use

use of many arguments which I have borrowed from works I have read upon a subject which so nearly affects us; that one of these is, "War with France, or, who pays the Reckoning;" another, "A Letter to the K—g;" both published by Ridgway; another is, "Considerations on the State of Parties, and the Means of effecting a Reconciliation between them," by T. Brigge, printed for Robinsons, Pater-noster-row, &c. &c. price 1s. a work which quotations cannot do justice, as an attentive perusal of it must, I think, convince the unprejudiced of the necessity of a change of system. Another work, which I have quoted from, and I am sensible, done injustice to by curtailing, for the sake of lessening the number of these pages, is, "Considerations, &c. &c." printed for Jordan, Fleet-street. I shall conclude by transcribing from this last, the author's sentiments on the consequences of the French revolution; premising, however, that what he says of the French, does not at all detract from the excellence of the English Constitution, which being in its real and pure state, may include every advantage which any republic can boast. After tracing the event to its origin, and making it appear that it was not the work of a moment, but the result of the misconduct of the government on one side; and on the other, of the increase of knowledge, disseminated gradually by the writings of French authors from the time of Louis XIVth, he proceeds, "This event has been compared by many speculativists to a meteor darting through the sky; filling the beholders with astonishment and fear at its momentary appearance, and illuminating the horizon with preternatural, but temporary radiance: and in conformity with this idea, they are waiting for its equally precipitate evanescence, when the twilight of evening shall resume its sober reign among the habitations of men.

But

" But were I to hazard a conjecture concerning futurity;
 " I should liken it to the dawn of the morning, which
 " announces the approach of the rising sun; that lumi-
 " nary which sheds a clear, a steady, and a beneficial
 " radiance over the works of nature; which is often ob-
 " scured by temporary clouds, and counteracted in its
 " benign influence by the violence of passing tempests;
 " which in its progress towards its meridian, can be
 " impeded by no power in the universe, but will pass in
 " regular succession through all the gradations of its
 " glory, till it arrives at the limits of its course, and
 " sinks, with all the objects on which its rays have been
 " reflected, into the darkness of primeval night. Such
 " will probably be found to be the progression of rational
 " improvement and universal liberty, as yet in the im-
 " perfect and defenceless state of infancy: but which,
 " notwithstanding all the disasters which it has encoun-
 " tered, and is still liable to sustain, will gain strength
 " with maturity, and correctness with experience; will
 " obtain a firm establishment in all the political systems
 " of mankind, and though delayed in its advances to
 " supremacy, will retain, and augment its influence and
 " authority, as the world shall endure."

THE END.

